arXiv:1404.5149v1 [math-ph] 21 Apr 2014

Tau functions and the limit of block Toeplitz determinants

Mattia Cafasso† and Chao-Zhong Wu‡

† LUNAM Université, LAREMA, Université d'Angers

2 Boulevard Lavoisier, 49045 Angers, France. cafasso@math.univ-angers.fr

‡ School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Sun Yat-sen University

Guangzhou 510275, P.R. China. wuchaozhong@sysu.edu.cn

Abstract

A classical way to introduce tau functions for integrable hierarchies of solitonic equations is by means of the Sato–Segal–Wilson infinite-dimensional Grassmannian. Every point in the Grassmannian is naturally related to a Riemann–Hilbert problem on the unit circle, for which Bertola proposed a tau function that generalizes the Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno tau function for isomonodromic deformation problems. In this paper, we prove that the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function and the (generalized) Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno isomonodromy tau function coincide under a very general setting, by identifying each of them to the large-size limit of a block Toeplitz determinant. As an application, we give a new definition of tau function for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies (and their generalizations) by means of infinite-dimensional Grassmannians, and clarify their relation with other tau functions given in the literature.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Grassmannians and Riemann–Hilbert problems **3**

2.1 The Sato–Segal–Wilson Grassmannian 3

2.2 The related Riemann-Hilbert problem 6

3 Tau functions and Toeplitz determinants **9**

3.1 Toeplitz determinant and the Szegö-Widom theorem 9

3.2 Tau functions as the large-size limit of block Toeplitz determinants 11

4 Tau functions of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies **13**

4.1 Affine Kac–Moody algebras and Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies 13

4.2 Tau functions of Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies 15

4.3 Tau functions of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies 19

1 Introduction

Tau functions were introduced in 1980s by the Kyoto school in the study of integrable equations. Since the very beginning (see for instance [14]), tau functions have been applied to other branches of mathematical physics, especially in statistical physics and, more recently, in the theory of random matrices and determinantal point processes. A classical way to introduce tau functions for integrable hierarchies of solitonic equations is by means of the Sato–Segal–Wilson infinite-dimensional Grassmannian [22, 24] whose points are sub-spaces of $L^2(S^1)$. On the other hand, it is known that a point in the Sato–Segal–Wilson Grassmannian is naturally related to a Riemann–Hilbert problem on the unit circle (see for instance [23] or the more recent [4]), and to an arbitrary (sufficiently regular) Riemann–Hilbert problem, Bertola [1] proposed a tau function that generalizes the Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno tau function [15] for isomonodromic deformation problems. Hence, a natural question is: what is the relationship between the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function and the (generalized) Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno isomonodromy tau function?

In this article, we will show (see Theorem 2.11 below) that the two tau functions above coincide under a very general setting, which includes not only the case of Gelfand–Dickey hierarchies but also *arbitrary* Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies [6] and some more recent generalizations of them [9, 20, 8]. As an immediate byproduct (Corollary 2.12), we will obtain, in this general setting, a formula that generalizes the so-called Sato formula (see (2.21) for the case of the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili (KP) hierarchy). This formula connects the matrix Baker function and the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function for the Grassmannian.

The proof of our main result is divided into two parts. Namely, we will identify each of the Sato–Segal–Wilson and the Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno tau function with the large-size limit of a block Toeplitz determinant [26, 27, 28]. The first part (the equivalence between the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function and the limit of a block Toeplitz determinant) is a natural generalization of the work by one of the author [4], who proved the equivalence in the case of Gelfand–Dickey (or n-reduced KP) hierarchies. Here we will use a different method, and the proof is much simplified. The second part is based on a theorem by Widom [28] (rederived by Its, Jin and Korepin in [11]) that links the Szegö–Widom asymptotic formula with the Riemann–Hilbert factorization of the related symbol, see Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 below.

As mentioned above, the Gelfand–Dickey hierarchies are contained in a more general class of integrable hierarchies proposed by Drinfeld and Sokolov [6]. In fact, Drinfeld and Sokolov constructed a Hamiltonian integrable hierarchy for every affine Kac–Moody algebra, and recovered the Gelfand–Dickey hierarchies when the the affine algebra is of type $A_n^{(1)}$. This construction was later generalized by de Groot, Hollowood and Miramontes [9, 20] (also by Feher, Harnad and Marshall [8]), who replaced the principal Heisenberg subalgebra by an arbitrary Heisenberg subalgebra corresponding to a certain gradation [17] of the affine algebra. Tau functions for the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies as well as their generalizations were investigated from several different points of view, e.g. representation theory [10], Hamiltonian formalism [20, 19, 29] and algebraic geometry [2, 22]. However, a Sato–Segal–Wilson construction for arbitrary Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies (and generalizations) is still missing, though some results in this direction can be found in [20]. We will deal with this issue here. What is more, we will clarify the relationship between the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function and the tau function of Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies defined by one of the authors in [29]. Hence, via the results in [29, 22], one can see the relation between the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function and the tau functions introduced in the literature [7, 10, 20, 22] from different background.

This article is organized as follows. In the following section, we will first recall the definition of

the Sato-Segal-Wilson Grassmannian, as well as the Baker function and tau function associated to it. Secondly, the related Riemann–Hilbert problem and its generalized Jimbo-Miwa-Ueno isomonodromy tau function will be considered; our main result will also be formulated. The proof of the main result will be given in Section 3, based on the properties of large-size block Toeplitz determinant. In Section 4, we will recall the tau function defined in [29] for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies associated to affine Kac–Moody algebras, then give a new definition of their tau functions via Sato-Segal-Wilson Grassmannian, which will be extended to the case of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies.

2 Grassmannians and Riemann–Hilbert problems

In this section we will review the notions of Baker function and tau function associated to the Sato–Segal–Wilson Grassmannian, and consider a related Riemann-Hilbert problem.

2.1 The Sato–Segal–Wilson Grassmannian

Let us recall some basic facts and notations about the Sato–Segal–Wilson infinite-dimensional Grassmannian, following the works [24, 21, 5]. We start with the Hilbert space of vector-valued L^2 functions

$$H^{(n)} := L^2(S^1, \mathbb{C}^n) = H_+^{(n)} \oplus H_-^{(n)} \tag{2.1}$$

where a function $v \in H^{(n)}$ is defined through its Fourier expansion $v(z) = \sum_k v_k z^k$ with v_k being column vectors, and $H_+^{(n)}$ (resp. $H_-^{(n)}$) is the subspace of series with non-negative (resp. negative) Fourier coefficients. Note, in particular, that elements in $H_+^{(n)}$ are boundary values of holomorphic functions on the disc $D_0 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| < 1\}$, while elements in $H_-^{(n)}$ are boundary values of holomorphic functions on the disc $D_\infty := \{z \in \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{C} \mid |z| > 1\}$. We also denote with $p_\pm$ the projections of $H^{(n)}$ onto its two subspaces $H_\pm^{(n)}$.

Clearly the vector space $H^{(n)}$ is spanned by the standard vectors $\{z^k \mathrm{e}_\alpha \mid \alpha = 1, \dots, n; k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where e_α is the column vector with its α-th component being 1 and the other components vanish. In other words, we can fix a basis of $H^{(n)} = H_-^{(n)} \oplus H_+^{(n)}$ whose elements are the columns of the following matrix in block form:

$$\left(\dots, z^{-2} I_n, z^{-1} I_n,\ I_n, z I_n, z^2 I_n, \dots\right), \tag{2.2}$$

where $I_n = (\mathrm{e}_1, \dots, \mathrm{e}_n)$ is the unit matrix. The bases of the subspaces $H_-^{(n)}$ and $H_+^{(n)}$ are fixed accordingly.

With respect to the basis given by (2.2), any vector $v(z) = \sum_k v_k z^k$ in $H^{(n)}$ can be identified with its coordinates as

$$v \sim \begin{pmatrix} \vdots \\ v_{-1} \\ v_0 \\ v_1 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.3}$$

Observe that our convention, for the purpose of comparing with Toeplitz matrices below, is slightly different from the one used in [24], where the index of Fourier coefficients increases going upwards.

Definition 2.1 ([24]) *The Sato–Segal–Wilson Grassmannian* $\mathrm{Gr}^{(n)}$ *is the collection of subspaces* $W \subseteq H^{(n)}$ *such that*

1. *the projection* $p_+ : W \to H_+^{(n)}$ *is a Fredholm operator, namely, both its kernel and its cokernel are of finite dimension;*
2. *the projection* $p_- : W \to H_-^{(n)}$ *is a compact operator;*
3. $zW \subseteq W$*.*

The Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^{(n)}$ has a deep relationship with loop groups [21, 24]. Let

$$LGL_n := \{\gamma : S^1 \to GL_n\}$$

be the group of invertible continuous loops. It acts naturally on H by multiplication as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} LGL_n \times H^{(n)} & \longrightarrow & H^{(n)} \\ (\gamma, v) & \longmapsto & \gamma \cdot v. \end{array} \tag{2.4}$$

According to [21], one can modify LGL_n to a group of some particular measurable loops and makes the action (2.4) transitive on $\mathrm{Gr}^{(n)}$. More precisely, given a measurable loop $\gamma(z) = \sum_k \gamma_k z^k$, introduce the following two norms:

$$\|\gamma\|_\infty := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{|z|=1} \|\gamma(z)\| \qquad \|\gamma\|_{2,1/2} := \sum_k \Big(|k| \, \|\gamma_k\|^2 \Big)^{1/2}, \tag{2.5}$$

where we denoted with $\|\cdot\|$ the standard Hilbert–Schmidt norm.

Definition 2.2 The loop group $L_{1/2}GL_n$ is composed of all invertible measurable loops γ taking value in GL_n such that

$$\|\gamma\|_\infty + \|\gamma\|_{2,1/2} < \infty.$$

Analogously, we denote with $L_{1/2}U_n$ its subgroup consisting of loops taking values in the unitary group.

Theorem 2.3 (Theorem 8.3.2 in [21]) *The group* $L_{1/2}U_n$ *acts transitively on* $\mathrm{Gr}^{(n)}$*, and the isotropy group of* $H_+^{(n)}$ *is* U_n*, i.e., the group of constant loops.*

A subspace $W \in \mathrm{Gr}^{(n)}$ is said to be transversal (to $H_-^{(n)}$) if

$$p_+|_W : W \longrightarrow H_+^{(n)}$$

is a one-to-one correspondence. All transversal subspaces in $\mathrm{Gr}^{(n)}$ compose the so-called big cell of the Grassmannian, which will be denoted as $\mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)} = \mathrm{Gr}^0$, following the notation in [18] and omitting the subscript "(n)" when no ambiguity arises. In particular, we can associate to every element of the big cell Gr^0 a loop with some definite asymptotic property.

Corollary 2.4 *For any $W \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$, it exists a unique loop $\gamma \in L_{1/2}U_n$ such that*

$$W = \gamma H_+^{(n)}; \quad p_+(\gamma) = \mathrm{Id}.$$

Proof: According to Theorem 2.3, it exists $\tilde{\gamma} \in L_{1/2}U_n$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}H_+^{(n)} = W$. Since $W \in \mathrm{Gr}^0$, we have $p_+(\tilde{\gamma}) = \tilde{\gamma}_0$, with $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ being constant and invertible (Otherwise there would not be n linear independent vectors $\{w_\alpha \mid \alpha = 1, \ldots, n\}$ in W such that $p_+(w_\alpha) = \mathrm{e}_\alpha$ for $\alpha = 1, \ldots, n$). Now we take $\gamma(z) := \tilde{\gamma}(z)\tilde{\gamma}_0^{-1}$, then we obtain γ with the right asymptotic property and, of course, such that $\gamma H_+^{(n)} = W$.

For the uniqueness, suppose that there exist $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma} \in L_{1/2}U_n$ satisfying $p_+(\gamma) = p_+(\tilde{\gamma}) = \mathrm{Id}$ and $\gamma H_+^{(n)} = \tilde{\gamma}H_+^{(n)} = W$. Let $\gamma^{[\alpha]}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^{[\alpha]}$ denote the α-th columns of these loops. Clearly, $\gamma^{[\alpha]} - \tilde{\gamma}^{[\alpha]} \in W$. Since $p_+(\gamma^{[\alpha]} - \tilde{\gamma}^{[\alpha]}) = 0$, and $p_+|_W$ is injective, then $\gamma^{[\alpha]} = \tilde{\gamma}^{[\alpha]}$. Note that α is arbitrary, thus we obtain $\gamma = \tilde{\gamma}$. □

Now denote with G_+ the group of loops $g(z)$ in $L_{1/2}U_n$ which extend analytically to the whole plane such that $g(0) \in U_n$, and consider an (arbitrary) abelian subgroup $G_+^a \subseteq G_+$. The following definition is taken from [5] and it is a generalization of the one in [24] for the matrix case. There, we say that a matrix-valued function belongs to a certain point $W \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ if all the columns do.

Definition 2.5 *Suppose an element $W \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ is given. A matrix function $w(g; z)$, depending on $g \in G_+^a$ and $z \in S^1$, is called the Baker function associated to W if*

1. *$w(g; z) \in W$ for almost all $g \in G_+^a$;*
2. *$p_+(g^{-1}w(g; z)) = \mathrm{Id}$.*

The definition above needs some clarifications. When we write that "*$w(g; z) \in W$ for almost all $g \in G_+^a$*" we mean that this is true for every $g \in G_+^a$ such that $g^{-1}W$ is transversal to $H_-^{(n)}$ (which is a condition generically satisfied, see [24]). Then the existence of $w(g; z)$, when $g^{-1}W$ is transversal to $H_-^{(n)}$, is deduced from Corollary 2.4. Indeed, let $\varphi_g \in L_{1/2}U_n$ such that $g^{-1}W = \varphi_g H_+^{(n)}$ and $p_+(\varphi_g) = \mathrm{Id}$. We just define $w(g; z) := g(z)\varphi_g(z)$, and it is immediately seen that the two conditions above are satisfied. Note also that, from the unicity of φ_g, we deduce the uniqueness of $w(g; z)$, and this explains why we speak about *the* Baker function associated to W. We remark that the uniqueness of the Baker function can also be derived from the uniqueness of solution of the Riemann–Hilbert problem in Proposition 2.7 below.

Now we proceed to recall the definition of the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function for a point in the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ acted by an abelian group G_+^a. For convenience, we will denote with W_γ the point corresponding to the (unique) $\gamma \in L_{1/2}U_n$ such that $p_+(\gamma) = \mathrm{Id}$. Given $W_\gamma \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$, we consider γ as a map from $H_+^{(n)}$ to $H^{(n)}$ by multiplication to the left. Then the point $W = W_\gamma$ can be described via a $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrix representation of the map γ with respect to the bases of $H_+^{(n)}$ and

of $H^{(n)}$ fixed in (2.2), that is,

$$W \sim \Big(\gamma_{j-k}\Big)_{j\in\mathbb{Z},k\in\mathbb{N}} := \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \iddots \\ \gamma_{-1} & \gamma_{-2} & \gamma_{-3} & \cdots \\ \gamma_0 & \gamma_{-1} & \gamma_{-2} & \cdots \\ \gamma_1 & \gamma_0 & \gamma_{-1} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.6}$$

with blocks being the Fourier coefficients of γ.

Let $\omega_\pm := p_\pm \circ \gamma$, these being maps

$$\omega_\pm : H^{(n)}_+ \longrightarrow H^{(n)}_\pm.$$

We also introduce a map

$$h_W : H^{(n)}_+ \to H^{(n)}_- \tag{2.7}$$

whose graph is W_γ, namely,

$$h_W := \omega_- \circ \omega_+^{-1} = p_-|_W \circ (p_+|_W)^{-1} \tag{2.8}$$

(again we have used the property that $p_+|_W$ is one-to-one).

On the other hand, every element $g \in G^a_+$ defines a map by multiplication

$$g : H^{(n)} \longrightarrow H^{(n)}.$$

Its inverse can be written in matrix form (due to the basis (2.2) we have fixed) as

$$g^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} d & 0 \\ b & a \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$a : H^{(n)}_+ \to H^{(n)}_+, \quad b : H^{(n)}_- \to H^{(n)}_+, \quad d : H^{(n)}_- \to H^{(n)}_-.$$

Definition 2.6 ([24]) *Given a point $W \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$, the associated tau function depending on $g \in G^a_+$ is defined as*

$$\tau_{SSW}(g) := \det\Big(\mathrm{Id} + a^{-1} \circ b \circ h_W\Big) = \det\Big(\mathrm{Id} + b \circ h_W \circ a^{-1}\Big). \tag{2.9}$$

2.2 The related Riemann-Hilbert problem

Given a subspace $W_\gamma \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$, we want to associate to it a Riemann–Hilbert problem depending on $g \in G^a_+$.

Let us introduce the following matrix

$$J_\gamma(g; z) := g^{-1}(z)\gamma(z), \quad z \in S^1. \tag{2.10}$$

We choose an (infinite) set of coordinates $\mathbf{t}$ on the abelian group G^a_+, and consider the following Riemann-Hilbert problem with the jump matrix $J_\gamma(\mathbf{t}; z) = J_\gamma(g; z)$:

Problem 2.1 *Find the (unique) sectionally-analytic function* $\Gamma(\mathbf{t};z)$ *on* $\mathbb{C}\setminus S^1$ *such that*

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_+(\mathbf{t};z) &= \Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z), \quad \forall z\in S^1, \\ \\ \Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z) &\sim \mathrm{Id}+\mathcal{O}(z^{-1}), \quad z\longrightarrow\infty. \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

Here the unit circle S^1 is oriented counter-clockwise, $\Gamma_+(\mathbf{t};z)$ denotes the restriction of $\Gamma(\mathbf{t};z)$ to the unit disk D_0 and $\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)$ the restriction to its complement.

Proposition 2.7 *Given a Baker function* $w(\mathbf{t};z)$ *for the point* $W_\gamma=\gamma(z)H_+^{(n)}\in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ *acted by* G_+^a*, the function*

$$\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z):=w^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)g(\mathbf{t};z) \tag{2.12}$$

solves the Riemann-Hilbert problem 2.1. Conversely, suppose that $\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)$ *is the solution of Problem 2.1, then*

$$w(\mathbf{t};z):=g(\mathbf{t};z)\Gamma_-^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z) \tag{2.13}$$

is a Baker function for the point $W_\gamma\in\mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$*. In summary, given a point of the Grassmannian* $\mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$*, the Riemann–Hilbert problem 2.1 is solvable if and only if the Baker function exists.*

Proof: Suppose $w(\mathbf{t};z)$ is a Baker function, then $p_+(g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)w(\mathbf{t};z))=\mathrm{Id}$, hence also

$$p_+[(g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)w(\mathbf{t};z))^{-1}]=\mathrm{Id}.$$

Moreover,

$$w^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)g(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\gamma(z)=w^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\gamma(z) \tag{2.14}$$

and the right hand side $w^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\gamma(z)=(\gamma^{-1}(z)w(\mathbf{t};z))^{-1}$ belongs to $H_+^{(n)}$; indeed we have

$$w(\mathbf{t};z)\in\gamma H_+^{(n)}=W_\gamma$$

so that $\gamma^{-1}(z)w(\mathbf{t};z)\in H_+^{(n)}$. Observe that the equality (2.14) is just $\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z)=\Gamma_+(\mathbf{t};z)$. Thus the first assertion is proven.

Conversely, given a solution of the Riemann–Hilbert problem, let us check that the function $w(\mathbf{t};z)$ in (2.13) satisfies the two conditions in Definition 2.5. First, we have

$$\gamma^{-1}(z)w(\mathbf{t};z)=\gamma^{-1}(z)g(\mathbf{t};z)\Gamma_-^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)=(\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z))^{-1}=\Gamma_+^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\in H_+^{(n)}.$$

Hence $w(\mathbf{t};z)\in\gamma(z)H_+^{(n)}$. Second,

$$p_+(g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)w(\mathbf{t};z))=p_+(\Gamma_-^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z))=\mathrm{Id}. \tag{2.15}$$

Therefore the proposition is proven. □

Given a solution of the Riemann–Hilbert problem (2.11), the so-called Malgrange form ω_M is defined by (see [1] and references therein)

$$\omega_M(\partial_t):=\oint_{S^1}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Gamma_-^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\partial_z\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot\Xi_t(\mathbf{t};z)\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}, \tag{2.16}$$

where $\Xi_t(\mathbf{t};z)=\partial_tJ_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z)^{-1}$ for any $t\in\mathbf{t}$.

Lemma 2.8 *The Malgrange form ω_M for Riemann–Hilbert problem* (2.11) *is closed.*

Proof: The exterior differential of ω_M is given in Proposition 2.1 in [1], which reads

$$\partial_{t'}\omega(\partial_t) - \partial_t\omega(\partial_{t'}) = \frac{1}{2}\oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Xi_{t'}(\mathbf{t};z)\partial_z\Xi_t(\mathbf{t};z) - \partial_z\Xi_{t'}(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot\Xi_t(\mathbf{t};z)\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} \tag{2.17}$$

for any $t, t' \in \mathbf{t}$. In the present case, we have

$$\Xi_t(\mathbf{t};z) = \partial_t(g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\gamma(z))\cdot\gamma^{-1}(z)g(\mathbf{t};z) = -g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\partial_t g(\mathbf{t};z),$$

which is analytic on the whole complex plane. Thus the right hand side of (2.17) vanishes. The lemma is proved. □

Definition 2.9 ([1]) *The (generalized) Jimbo-Miwa-Ueno isomonodromic tau function for the Riemann–Hilbert problem 2.1, supposed solvable, is defined up to a constant factor by*

$$\partial_t \log\tau_{JMU}(\mathbf{t}) = \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Gamma_-^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\partial_z\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot\partial_t J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot J_\gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} \tag{2.18}$$

for any $t \in \mathbf{t}$.

Remark 2.10 In [1] a tau function was introduced by Bertola for a general Riemann–Hilbert problem on the Riemann sphere, under very mild assumptions. He also showed that, whenever the Riemann–Hilbert problem is associated to the isomonodromy data of an ODE, the tau function coincides with the isomonodromy tau function of Jimbo, Miwa and Ueno [12, 13, 15]. This is why we use the notation τ_{JMU}. □

In consideration of the equivalence between the Baker function and the solution of the Riemann–Hilbert problem, it is natural to study the relation between the Sato–Segal–Wilson and the Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno isomonodromy tau function. This is what we plan to do in the next section, identifying both tau functions with the Szegö–Widom pre-factor $D_\infty(J_\gamma)$ (see below). As a result, we will obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 2.11 *Given a point $W = \gamma H_+^{(n)} \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ acted by a group G_+^a, the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function $\tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t})$ defined in* (2.9) *coincides (up to constants) with the isomonodromic tau function $\tau_{JMU}(\mathbf{t})$ associated to the Riemann–Hilbert problem 2.1.*

In combination of Proposition 2.7 and Theorem 2.11, we obtain immediately

Corollary 2.12 *Given a point $W = \gamma H_+^{(n)} \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ acted by $g(\mathbf{t};z) \in G_+^a$, the Baker function and the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function are related by*

$$\partial_t \log\tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t}) = \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\partial_z w(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot w^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\partial_t g(\mathbf{t};z)\cdot g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} \tag{2.19}$$

for any $t \in \mathbf{t}$ of G_+^a.

Proof: One substitutes (2.12) and (2.10) into (2.18), then gets

$$\partial_t \log \tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t}) = \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\partial_z(g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)w(\mathbf{t};z)) \cdot w^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)g(\mathbf{t};z) \cdot g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\partial_t g(\mathbf{t};z)\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}. \tag{2.20}$$

The equality is converted to (2.19) by using that $g(\mathbf{t};z)$ is analytic for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. The lemma is proved. □

Remark 2.13 The equalities (2.20) or (2.19) can be understood as some generalization of the Sato formula that connects Baker function and tau function in scalar case. For instance, the Sato formula for the KP hierarchy reads

$$w(\mathbf{t};z) = g(\mathbf{t};z)\frac{\tau(\mathbf{t}-[z^{-1}])}{\tau(\mathbf{t})}, \quad g(\mathbf{t};z) = \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k z^k\right), \tag{2.21}$$

where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots)$ and $[z] = (z/1, z^2/2, z^3/3, \dots)$. It is easy to check that this formula agrees with the equality (2.20). □

An immediate application of Corollary 2.12 is to deduce a connection between the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function and the matrix Baker function of the AKNS-D hierarchy in [5]. What is more, the formula (2.20) will be used to study the relationship of τ_{SSW} for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies and their tau functions introduced in [29], see Section 4 below.

3 Tau functions and Toeplitz determinants

In this section let us proceed to prove Theorem 2.11.

3.1 Toeplitz determinant and the Szegö-Widom theorem

First we digress to review some results on large-size block Toeplitz determinants to be used in the present article. These results, due to Widom, can be found in [26, 27, 28]. Some of our notations are borrowed from [3].

Given a loop $\varphi = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \varphi_j z^j \in L_{1/2}GL_n$, it is easy to see that the operator of multiplication

$$\varphi : H^{(n)} \longrightarrow H^{(n)},$$

for the basis (2.2), has (block) matrix representation given by the *Laurent* matrix $L(\varphi) := (\varphi_{j-k})_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}}$. In the sequel, given $\varphi \in L_{1/2}U_n$, we are interested in the following associated $\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}$ matrices:

$$T(\varphi) := \Big(\varphi_{j-k}\Big)_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}; \quad H(\varphi) := \Big(\varphi_{j+k+1}\Big)_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}; \quad \widetilde{H}(\varphi) := \Big(\varphi_{-j-k-1}\Big)_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}. \tag{3.1}$$

The first matrix is the so-called (block) Toeplitz matrix associated to the symbol φ, while the second and the third are the two Haënkel matrices associated to φ.

Let us introduce the following involution operator

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : H^{(n)} &\longrightarrow H^{(n)} \\ v(z) &\longmapsto v(z^{-1})z^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Clearly, $\iota \circ \iota = \mathrm{Id}$, and the restrictions $\iota : H^{(n)}_{\pm} \to H^{(n)}_{\mp}$ are one-to-one correspondences. It is easy to check that the matrices above are the matrix representations of the following operators (endomorphisms of $H^{(n)}_{+}$):

$$T(\varphi) = p_+ \circ \varphi|_{H^{(n)}_+}; \quad H(\varphi) = p_+ \circ \varphi \circ \iota|_{H^{(n)}_+}; \quad \widetilde{H}(\varphi) = \iota \circ p_- \circ \varphi|_{H^{(n)}_+}. \tag{3.3}$$

Using (3.3) it turns out to be a convenient way to write identities between $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices, as the following useful lemma will show (see, for instance, [3]):

Lemma 3.1 *Given $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L_{1/2}GL_n$, we have the following identity between $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices:*

$$T(\varphi_1)T(\varphi_2) = T(\varphi_1\varphi_2) - H(\varphi_1)\widetilde{H}(\varphi_2). \tag{3.4}$$

Proof: Starting from the left hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(\varphi_1)T(\varphi_2) &= p_+ \circ \varphi_1 \circ p_+ \circ \varphi_2|_{H^{(n)}_+} = p_+ \circ \varphi_1 \circ (\mathrm{Id} - p_-) \circ \varphi_2|_{H^{(n)}_+} \\ &= p_+ \circ (\varphi_1\varphi_2)|_{H^{(n)}_+} - p_+ \circ \varphi \circ \iota \circ \iota \circ p_- \circ \varphi_2|_{H^{(n)}_+} \\ &= T(\varphi_1\varphi_2) - H(\varphi_1)\widetilde{H}(\varphi_2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Thus the lemma is proved. □

Also, from the definition of $L_{1/2}GL_n$ it follows that both $H(\varphi)$ and $\widetilde{H}(\varphi^{-1})$ are Hilbert–Schmidt operators; hence their product is a trace-class operator and, consequently, the Fredholm determinant of the operator $\mathrm{Id} - H(\varphi)\widetilde{H}(\varphi^{-1})$ is well defined (see for instance [25]).

Now let $T_N(\varphi)$ denote the $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ upper-left principal minor of $T(\varphi)$, that is,

$$T_N(\varphi) := \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_0 & \varphi_{-1} & \cdots & \varphi_{-N} \\ \varphi_1 & \varphi_0 & \cdots & \varphi_{-N+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \varphi_N & \varphi_{N-1} & \cdots & \varphi_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

whose determinant is denoted as $D_N(\varphi)$. Below is the celebrated Szegö–Widom theorem.

Theorem 3.2 (Szegö–Widom theorem [28]) *Assume $\varphi \in L_{1/2}GL_n$. Then it exists the large-size limit*

$$D_\infty(\varphi) := \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{D_N(\varphi)}{G(\varphi)^{N+1}} = \det\Big(T(\varphi)T(\varphi^{-1})\Big) = \det\Big(\mathrm{Id} - H(\varphi)\widetilde{H}(\varphi^{-1})\Big), \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$G(\varphi) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \log\big(\det\varphi(e^{\mathrm{i}\theta})\big)d\theta\right).$$

Let us also recall a result, again due to Widom (and rederived in [11] with a different approach), connecting the Riemann–Hilbert factorizations of the symbol φ with $D_\infty(\varphi)$.

Theorem 3.3 (Theorem 4.1 in [26]) *Suppose that a loop φ satisfies the conditions imposed in the Szegö–Widom theorem, and moreover it depends in a differentiable way on a given parameter t. If $\varphi^{-1}(z)$ admits two Riemann–Hilbert factorizations*

$$\varphi^{-1}(z) = T_+(z)T_-(z) = S_-(z)S_+(z), \quad z \in S^1 \tag{3.7}$$

with

$$T_+(z) := \sum_{k\geq 0}(T_+)_k z^k, \qquad S_+(z) := \sum_{k\geq 0}(S_+)_k z^k,$$
$$T_-(z) := \sum_{k\leq 0}(T_-)_k z^k, \qquad S_-(z) := \sum_{k\leq 0}(S_-)_k z^k,$$

then

$$\partial_t \log(D_\infty(\varphi)) = -\oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\left[\Big((\partial_z T_+)T_- - (\partial_z S_-)S_+\Big)\partial_t\varphi\right]\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}. \tag{3.8}$$

3.2 Tau functions as the large-size limit of block Toeplitz determinants

Let us come back to the setting in Section 2. For any point $W_\gamma = \gamma(z)H_+^{(n)} \in \mathrm{Gr}_0^{(n)}$ acted by $g(\mathbf{t};z) \in G_+^a$, one has the following jump matrix for the related Riemann–Hilbert problem

$$J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z) := g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)\gamma(z), \quad z \in S^1. \tag{3.9}$$

The first step to prove Theorem 2.11 is the following

Theorem 3.4 *The large-size limit of the block Toeplitz determinant $D_\infty(J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z))$ coincides with the corresponding Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function defined by* (2.9)*, that is,*

$$D_\infty(J_\gamma(\mathbf{t};z)) = \tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t}). \tag{3.10}$$

Proof: By the very definition in Section 2, we have

$$\tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t}) = \det(\mathrm{Id} + b \circ \omega_- \circ \omega_+^{-1} \circ a^{-1})$$

where the terms in the determinant can be written as follows:

$$a^{-1} = p_+ \circ g|_{H_+^{(n)}}; \qquad b = p_+ \circ g^{-1}|_{H_-^{(n)}}; \tag{3.11}$$
$$\omega_+^{-1} = p_+ \circ \gamma^{-1}|_{H_+^{(n)}}; \quad \omega_- = p_- \circ \gamma|_{H_+^{(n)}}. \tag{3.12}$$

Hence we have [1]

$$\tau_{SSW} = \det\Big(\mathrm{Id} + p_+ g^{-1} p_- \gamma\, p_+ \gamma^{-1} g|_{H_+^{(n)}}\Big). \tag{3.13}$$

On the other hand, by virtue of Theorem 3.2 and the relations (3.3) we have

$$D_\infty(J_\gamma) \quad = \quad \det(T(J_\gamma)T(J_\gamma^{-1}))$$

[1] Here and below we suppress the sign of composition.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \det\Big(p_+ g^{-1}\gamma\, p_+\gamma^{-1} g|_{H_+^{(n)}}\Big)\\
&= \det\Big(\mathrm{Id} - p_+ g^{-1}\gamma\, p_-\gamma^{-1} g|_{H_+^{(n)}}\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.14}
$$

Combining (3.13) and (3.14), it is sufficient to prove

$$
\big(p_+ g^{-1} p_-\gamma\, p_+\gamma^{-1} g + p_+ g^{-1}\gamma\, p_-\gamma^{-1} g\big)\big|_{H_+^{(n)}} = 0. \tag{3.15}
$$

Indeed, the left hand side is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{l.h.s.} &= \big(-p_+ g^{-1} p_+\gamma\, p_+\gamma^{-1} g + p_+ g^{-1}\gamma\, p_+\gamma^{-1} g + p_+ g^{-1}\gamma\, p_-\gamma^{-1} g\big)\big|_{H_+^{(n)}}\\
&= \big(-p_+ g^{-1}\omega_+\, \omega_+^{-1} g + p_+ g^{-1}\gamma\, \gamma^{-1} g\big)\big|_{H_+^{(n)}}\\
&= (-\mathrm{Id} + \mathrm{Id})|_{H_+^{(n)}} = 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.16}
$$

Thus we conclude the theorem. □

The equivalence between the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau functions and certain large-size block Toeplitz determinants was established, for the case of Gelfand–Dickey hierarchies, by one of the authors in [4]. The proof in the present article is completely different in nature. Indeed, it is more general and much more straightforward. On the other hand, as a byproduct of the proof in [4], we obtained that also each $D_N(J_\gamma)$, and not just the limit for $N \to \infty$, is a tau function. In this article, no similar statement is made about $D_N(J_\gamma)$.

Let us now study the relationship between $D_\infty(J_\gamma)$ and the Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno isomonodromy tau function.

Theorem 3.5 *Up to a constant factor, the large-size limit of the block Toeplitz determinant $D_\infty(J_\gamma(\mathbf{t}; z))$ coincides with the Jimbo–Miwa–Ueno isomonodromy tau function defined by* (2.18)*, that is,*

$$
D_\infty(J_\gamma(\mathbf{t}; z)) = \tau_{JMU}(\mathbf{t}). \tag{3.17}
$$

Proof: We need to show

$$
\partial_t \log D_\infty(J_\gamma(\mathbf{t}; z)) = \partial_t \log \tau_{JMU}(\mathbf{t}) \tag{3.18}
$$

for any t in the coordinates $\mathbf{t}$ of the group G_+^a.

The inverse of J_γ has the following two Riemann–Hilbert factorizations

$$
J_\gamma^{-1} = \gamma^{-1}(z) g(\mathbf{t}; z) = S_- S_+, \tag{3.19}
$$

$$
J_\gamma^{-1} = \Gamma_+^{-1}(\mathbf{t}; z)\Gamma_-(\mathbf{t}; z) = T_+ T_-. \tag{3.20}
$$

According to Theorem 3.3, we have (here the prime denotes the derivative with respect to z, and $J = J_\gamma$ to avoid lengthy notations)

$$
\partial_t \log D_\infty(J) = \oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big((\Gamma_+^{-1}\Gamma'_+\Gamma_+^{-1}\Gamma_- - \gamma^{-1}\gamma'\gamma^{-1} g)\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}. \tag{3.21}
$$

Let $I_1 - I_2$ denote the right hand side of (3.21). We have

$$
I_1 = \oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Gamma_+^{-1}(\Gamma'_- J + \Gamma_- J')\Gamma_+^{-1}\Gamma_-\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}
$$

$$= \oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big(J^{-1}\Gamma_-^{-1}\Gamma_-'\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} + \oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big(J^{-1}J'J^{-1}\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}, \tag{3.22}$$

in which the second term reads

$$\begin{aligned} -\oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big((J^{-1})'\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} =& -\oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big((-\gamma^{-1}\gamma'\gamma^{-1}g+\gamma^{-1}g')\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} \\ =& I_2 - \oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\gamma^{-1}g'\partial_t g^{-1}\cdot\gamma\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} \\ =& I_2 - 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Thus

$$\partial_t \log D_\infty(J) = I_1 - I_2 = \oint \mathrm{Tr}\Big(J^{-1}\Gamma_-^{-1}\Gamma_-'\partial_t J\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}, \tag{3.24}$$

which coincides with $\partial_t \log \tau_{JMU}$ by the definition in (2.18), hence the equality (3.18) is valid. Therefore the theorem is proved. □

Finally, taking Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 together, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.11.

4 Tau functions of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies

In [6] Drinfeld and Sokolov constructed a Hamiltonian integrable hierarchy of Korteweg–de Vries (KdV) type associated to every affine Kac–Moody algebra. Provided a solution of the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy, we want to give a Grassmannian construction for its tau function, and compare it with other tau functions introduced in the literature. In the same way, tau functions of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies proposed by Groot, Hollowood and Miramontes [9, 10] will also be considered.

4.1 Affine Kac–Moody algebras and Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies

Let $A = (a_{ij})_{0\le i,j\le l}$ be a Cartan matrix of affine type $X_N^{(r)}$, and $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ be the corresponding Kac–Moody algebra. This algebra can be realized as follows.

Introduce a set of integer vectors (known as gradations):

$$\Gamma = \{(s_0, s_1, \dots, s_l) \in \mathbb{Z}^{l+1} \mid s_i \ge 0, s_0 + s_1 + \cdots + s_l > 0\}. \tag{4.1}$$

For example, the following vectors

$$\mathrm{s}^0 = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad \mathrm{s}^1 = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \tag{4.2}$$

are called the homogeneous and the principal gradations respectively. Given an arbitrary vector $\mathrm{s} = (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_l) \in \Gamma$, denote $N_\mathrm{s} = \sum_{i=0}^l k_i s_i$, where k_i are the Kac labels of $\mathfrak{g}(A)$, i.e., the lowest positive integers solving $\sum_{j=0}^l a_{ij}k_j = 0$. Note, in particular, that $k_0 = 1$ in all cases except $k_0 = 2$ for the case of type $A_{2l}^{(2)}$.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the simple Lie algebra of type X_N, whose Dynkin diagram has an automorphism of order r. The Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$ is generated by certain special elements E_i, F_i and H_i $(i = 0, 1, \dots, l)$ as presented in § 8.3 of [16]. Given an integer vector $\mathrm{s} \in \Gamma$, it induces a $\mathbb{Z}/rN_\mathrm{s}\mathbb{Z}$-gradation

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{rN_\mathrm{s}-1} \mathcal{G}_k$$

by assigning

$$\deg E_i = s_i, \quad \deg F_i = -s_i, \quad \deg H_i = 0, \qquad 0 \le i \le l.$$

With the help of a parameter z, the affine Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ graded by s can be realized as (in the present paper the scaling element d is not needed)

$$\mathfrak{g}(A;\mathrm{s}) = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big(z^k \otimes \mathcal{G}_{k \mod rN_\mathrm{s}} \Big) \oplus \mathbb{C}\, c. \tag{4.3}$$

Here c is the canonical central element, and the Lie bracket between elements of the form $X(k), Y(k) \in z^k \otimes \mathcal{G}_{k \bmod rN_\mathrm{s}}$ is defined by

$$[X(j), Y(k)] = [X, Y](j+k) + \delta_{j,-k} \frac{j}{rN_\mathrm{s}} (X \mid Y)_0\, c, \tag{4.4}$$

with $(\,\cdot \mid \cdot\,)_0$ being the standard invariant symmetric bilinear form on $\mathcal{G}$.

A set of Weyl generators of $\mathfrak{g}(A;\mathrm{s})$ can be chosen as

$$e_i^{(\mathrm{s})} = E_i(s_i), \quad f_i^{(\mathrm{s})} = F_i(-s_i), \quad \alpha_i^{\vee(\mathrm{s})} = H_i(0) + \frac{k_i s_i}{k_i^\vee N_\mathrm{s}} c, \tag{4.5}$$

where k_i and $k_i^\vee$ are the Kac labels and the dual Kac labels respectively, and $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$. Under the gradation s, we have

$$\deg e_i^{(\mathrm{s})} = s_i, \quad \deg f_i^{(\mathrm{s})} = -s_i, \quad \deg \alpha_i^{\vee(\mathrm{s})} = 0, \qquad 0 \le i \le l. \tag{4.6}$$

In particular, the elements $\alpha_i^{\vee(\mathrm{s})}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=0}^l k_i^\vee \alpha_i^{\vee(\mathrm{s})} = c$ and they generate the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(A;\mathrm{s})$.

Given any other gradation $\mathrm{s}' \in \Gamma$, there is a natural isomorphism between $\mathfrak{g}(A;\mathrm{s})$ and $\mathfrak{g}(A;\mathrm{s}')$ induced by

$$e_i^{(\mathrm{s})} \mapsto e_i^{(\mathrm{s}')}, \quad f_i^{(\mathrm{s})} \mapsto f_i^{(\mathrm{s}')}.$$

Henceforth we simply write $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A)$ instead of $\mathfrak{g}(A;\mathrm{s})$. We also write $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_{j\,[\mathrm{s}]}$ graded by s, and use subscript "$< 0\,[\mathrm{s}]$" to stand for the projection $\mathrm{pr} : \mathfrak{g} \to \bigoplus_{j<0} \mathfrak{g}_{j\,[\mathrm{s}]}$, e.t.c.

A key role in the construction of Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies [6] is played by the principal Heisenberg subalgebra $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. More exactly, let E be the set of exponents of $\mathfrak{g}$, then there are elements $\Lambda_j \in \mathfrak{g}_{j\,[\mathrm{s}^1]}$ for $j \in E$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}']} = \mathbb{C}c \oplus \sum_{j\in E} \mathbb{C}\Lambda_j,$$

with

$$[\Lambda_j, \Lambda_k] = j\delta_{j,-k} c, \quad j, k \in E. \tag{4.7}$$

In particular, 1 is an exponent for every affine Kac–Moody algebra (see [16]), and $\Lambda = \Lambda_1$ is a semisimple element. Namely,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathcal{H} + \operatorname{Im} \mathrm{ad}_\Lambda, \quad \mathcal{H} \cap \operatorname{Im} \mathrm{ad}_\Lambda = \mathbb{C}c; \tag{4.8}$$

note $\ker \mathrm{ad}_\Lambda = \mathcal{H}$ modulo the center.

Introduce an operator

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} + \Lambda + q, \tag{4.9}$$

where q is a smooth function of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ taking value in $\big(\mathfrak{g}_{0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\le 0\,[\mathrm{s}^1]}\big) \big/ \mathbb{C}c$. By using the property (4.8), one has the following dressing proposition.

Proposition 4.1 ([6]) *There exists a smooth function $U \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^1]})$ such that the operator $\bar{\mathscr{L}} = e^{-\mathrm{ad}_U}\mathscr{L}$ has the form*

$$\bar{\mathscr{L}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} + \Lambda + H, \quad H \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^1]} \oplus \mathbb{C}\,c). \tag{4.10}$$

On $\mathfrak{g}$ the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy is defined by the following partial differential equations

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial t_j} = [(e^{\mathrm{ad}_U}\Lambda_j)_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]}, \mathscr{L}], \quad j \in E_{>0} \tag{4.11}$$

restricted to some equivalence class of $\mathscr{L}$ with respect to the gauge actions

$$\mathscr{L} \mapsto \tilde{\mathscr{L}} = e^{\mathrm{ad}_T}\mathscr{L}, \quad T \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{g}_{0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^1]}). \tag{4.12}$$

One can choose a special gauge slice of the operator $\mathscr{L}$ such that (see [10, 20]) it satisfies

$$\mathscr{L} = e^{\mathrm{ad}_V}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} + \Lambda\right) + f \cdot c, \tag{4.13}$$

where V is a function taking value in $\mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]}$ and f is a scalar function. Let $\Theta = e^V$, i.e., an element in the Kac–Moody group of $\mathfrak{g}$, then the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy (4.11) can be written equivalently as

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t_j} = (\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1})_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]}\,\Theta, \quad j \in E_{>0}. \tag{4.14}$$

We remark that both functions U and H in Proposition 4.1 are differential polynomials in q, but V above may not be a differential polynomial in q. An algorithm to calculate U, H and V was given by one of the authors in [29], and these functions define a tau function that is independent of the choice of gauge equivalent class of $\mathscr{L}$.

Definition 4.2 ([29]) *The tau function $\tau(\mathfrak{t})$ of the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy* (4.11) *is defined by*

$$\partial_{t_j} \log \tau = -(\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1})_c, \quad j \in E_{>0}, \tag{4.15}$$

where the subscript "c" means the coefficient of c with respect to the following decomposition of the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{C}\alpha_1^\vee \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}\alpha_l^\vee \oplus \mathbb{C}\,c.$$

4.2 Tau functions of Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies

Henceforth we identify $\mathcal{G}$ with its realization by $n \times n$ trace-less matrices as in [16, 6]. In this case, the standard invariant bilinear form reads

$$(X \mid Y)_0 = \kappa\,\mathrm{Tr}(XY), \quad X, Y \in \mathcal{G}$$

with some constant κ. For instance, $\kappa = 1$ for the special linear/sympletic algebras (types A and C) and $\kappa = 1/2$ for the special orthogonal algebras (types B and D), see the appendix of [6]. Accordingly, we realize $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A; \mathrm{s}^0)$ as (4.3) with s^0 being the homogeneous gradation.

Since $\mathcal{G}$ is realized by trace-less matrices, we consider z in (4.3) as a complex parameter, and take the following two subgroups of $L_{1/2}U_n$:

$$G_- = \left\{ e^X \in L_{1/2}U_n \mid X \in \mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]} \right\}, \tag{4.16}$$

$$G_+^a = \left\{ g(\mathbf{t};z) = \exp\left(\sum_{j\in E_{>0}} t_j \Lambda_j \right) \in L_{1/2}U_n \mid t_j \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \tag{4.17}$$

Observe that under the realization of $\mathfrak{g}$, every element of G_- takes the form $\mathrm{Id} + \mathcal{O}(z^{-1})$, and that G_+^a is an abelian group of functions holomorphic on the complex plane.

Assume $\Theta(\mathbf{t};z)$ to be an arbitrary solution of the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy (4.14). Clearly, $\Theta(\mathbf{t};z) = I + O(z^{-1})$ is a function taking value in the Lie group G_-. We introduce

$$w(\mathbf{t};z) = g(\mathbf{t};z)\Theta^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z), \quad g(\mathbf{t};z) \in G_+^a. \tag{4.18}$$

Proposition 4.3 *Given a point $W = \gamma(z)H_+^{(n)} \in \mathrm{Gr}^0_{(n)}$ with $\gamma(z) = \Theta^{-1}(0;z) \in G_-$, the function $w(\mathbf{t};z)$ is the corresponding Baker function that depends on the parameter $\mathbf{t}$ of G_+^a and $z \in S^1$.*

Proof: To simply notations, we will use subscripts "$\pm$" to stand for the projections $p_\pm$ given in Section 2, which is consistent with the following decomposition of affine Kac–Moody algebra

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{\geq 0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]}.$$

Recalling Definition 2.5, clearly $w(\mathbf{t};z)$ satisfies the second condition, namely

$$(g^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)w(\mathbf{t};z))_+ = \Theta^{-1}(\mathbf{t};z)_+ = \mathrm{Id}.$$

For the first condition, we only need to show that

$$\hat{w}(\mathbf{t};z) := \gamma^{-1}(z)w(\mathbf{t};z) \tag{4.19}$$

belongs to $H_+^{(n)}$. In fact, for every $j \in E_{>0}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t_j} w =& g\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1} - g\Theta^{-1}\partial_{t_j}\Theta\cdot\Theta^{-1} \\ =& g\Theta^{-1}\cdot\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1} - g\Theta^{-1}(\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1})_- \\ =& w(\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1})_+, \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

hence

$$\hat{w}^{-1}\partial_{t_j}\hat{w} = w^{-1}\partial_{t_j}w = (\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1})_+ \in \mathfrak{g}_{\geq 0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]}. \tag{4.21}$$

This together with the initial value $\hat{w}|_{\mathbf{t}=0} = \mathrm{Id}$ implies that the function $\hat{w}$ takes value in the Lie group of $\mathfrak{g}_{\geq 0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]}$; namely, $\hat{w}$ contains only nonnegative powers in z. Therefore the proposition is proved. □

Given the point $W = \gamma(z)H_+^{(n)}$ in the Grassmannian, it is defined the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function $\tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t})$ (recall Definition 2.6). Equivalently, this tau function is given by the generalized Sato formula (2.20) as

$$\partial_{t_j}\log\tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t}) = \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\partial_z\Theta^{-1}\cdot\Theta\Lambda_j\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} = -\oint_{S^1}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\partial_z\Theta\cdot\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1}\Big)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}} \tag{4.22}$$

with $j \in E_{>0}$. In other words, we obtain a tau function $\tau_{SSW}(\mathbf{t})$ of the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy (4.14).

Theorem 4.4 *For the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy* (4.11) *associated to* $\mathfrak{g}$*, the two tau functions defined by* (4.15) *and by* (4.22) *satisfy*

$$\log \tau = \frac{\kappa}{r\, k_0} \log \tau_{SSW}. \tag{4.23}$$

In order to prove this theorem, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5 *Under the homogeneous gradation of* $\mathfrak{g}$*, let* e^X *be a well defined element in the Kac–Moody group of* $\mathfrak{g}$*. Then for any* $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$*, the following equality holds true*

$$\left(e^X Y e^{-X}\right)_c = \frac{\kappa}{r\, k_0} \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\left((\partial_z e^X) Y e^{-X}\right) \frac{dz}{2\pi \mathbf{i}}. \tag{4.24}$$

Proof: In order to simplify notations, we write for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$:

$$X' = \partial_z X, \quad \langle X \rangle = \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}\,(X)\, \frac{dz}{2\pi \mathbf{i}}.$$

First of all, we have

$$\langle (\partial_z e^X) Y e^{-X} \rangle = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} R_m,$$

where

$$R_m = \left\langle \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{(-1)^k}{(m-k)!k!} (X' X^{m-k-1} + X X' X^{m-k-2} + \cdots + X^{m-k-1} X') Y X^k \right\rangle.$$

We rewrite R_m to

$$\begin{aligned} R_m =& \left\langle \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{(-1)^k}{(m-k)!k!} X' \sum_{j=0}^{m-k-1} X^j Y X^k \right\rangle \\ =& \frac{1}{m!} \left\langle X' \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-j-1} (-1)^k \binom{m}{k} X^j Y X^{m-1-j} \right\rangle \\ =& \frac{1}{m!} \left\langle X' \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{m-1-j} \binom{m-1}{m-1-j} X^j Y X^{m-1-j} \right\rangle \\ =& \frac{1}{m!} \left\langle X' (\mathrm{ad}_X)^{m-1} Y \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

where in the third equality we have employed recursively the formula

$$\binom{m-1}{k} - \binom{m}{k+1} = -\binom{m-1}{k+1}.$$

According to the homogeneous realization of $\mathfrak{g}$, we have $N_{\mathrm{s}^0} = k_0$, and it follows from (4.4) that

$$[A(z), B(z)]_c = \frac{\kappa}{r\, k_0} \oint_{S^1} \mathrm{Tr}(\partial_z A(z) \cdot B(z)) \frac{dz}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \tag{4.26}$$

for any $A(z), B(z) \in \mathfrak{g}$. By using this equality and (4.25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle(\partial_z e^X)Ye^{-X}\rangle =& \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{m!}\left[X,(\mathrm{ad}_X)^{m-1}Y\right]_c\cdot\frac{r\,k_0}{\kappa}\\ =& \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{m!}\left((\mathrm{ad}_X)^m Y\right)_c\cdot\frac{r\,k_0}{\kappa}\\ =&\frac{r\,k_0}{\kappa}(e^{\mathrm{ad}_X}Y)_c\\ =&\frac{r\,k_0}{\kappa}(e^X Ye^{-X})_c. \end{aligned}\tag{4.27}$$

The lemma is proved. □

Proof of Proposition 4.4 Recall (4.15) and by (4.22). For any $j \in E_{>0}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{t_j}\log\tau =& -(\Theta\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1})_c\\ =& -\frac{\kappa}{r\,k_0}\oint_{S^1}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\partial_z\Theta\cdot\Lambda_j\Theta^{-1}\right)\frac{dz}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}\\ =&\frac{\kappa}{r\,k_0}\partial_{t_j}\log\tau_{SSW}, \end{aligned}\tag{4.28}$$

where the second equality is due to Lemma 4.5. Therefore the proposition is proved. □

Example 4.6 Assume the affine Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ to be of type $A^{(1)}_{n-1}$ with $n \geq 2$. This Lie algebra contains a set of Weyl generators as follows:

$$e_0 = z\,e_{1,n}, \quad e_i = e_{i+1,i} \quad (1 \leq i \leq n-1), \tag{4.29}$$

$$f_0 = \frac{1}{z}e_{n,1}, \quad f_i = e_{i,i+1} \quad (1 \leq i \leq n-1), \tag{4.30}$$

$$\alpha_i^\vee = [e_i, f_i] \quad (0 \leq i \leq n-1), \tag{4.31}$$

where $e_{i,j}$ is the $n \times n$ matrix with its (i,j)-component being 1 and the others being zero. One has

$$\Lambda = e_0 + e_1 + \cdots + e_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & z \\ 1 & 0 & \ddots & & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.32}$$

The principal Heisenberg subalgebra $\mathcal{H}$ is generated by $\Lambda_j = \Lambda^j$ with $j \in E$, where $E = \mathbb{Z} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}$ is the set of of exponents of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Via gauge actions, the operator $\mathscr{L}$ in (4.9) can be converted to the following canonical form

$$q = q^{\mathrm{can}} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i\,e_{n-i,n} \tag{4.33}$$

with scalar functions u_i. According to [6], the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy (4.11) is equivalent to the Gelfand–Dickey (or n-reduced KP) hierarchy:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t_j} = [(L^{j/n})_+, L], \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus n\mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{4.34}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L &= {\partial_x}^n + u_1 {\partial_x}^{n-2} + \cdots + u_{n-2}\partial_x + u_{n-1}, \\ L^{1/n} &= \partial_x + v_1 {\partial_x}^{-1} + v_2 {\partial_x}^{-2} + \cdots , \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

and $(L^{j/n})_+$ means the differential part of the operator $L^{j/n}$. Recall that the multiplication between two pseudo-differential operators is defined by

$$u{\partial_x}^k \cdot v{\partial_x}^l = \sum_{m\geq 0} \binom{k}{m} u{\partial_x}^m(v){\partial_x}^{k+l-m}.$$

For the hierarchy (4.34) the tau function τ_{SSW} in (4.22) was also introduced in [24], which satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^2 \log \tau_{SSW}}{\partial x \partial t_j} = \operatorname{res} L^{j/n}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus n\mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.36}$$

Note that the residue of a pseudo-differential operator means its coefficient of ${\partial_x}^{-1}$.

On the other hand, the tau function τ of the hierarchy is defined by (4.15). In this case, Theorem 4.4 shows

$$\tau = \tau_{SSW},$$

which agrees with Example 5.1 in [29].

Similar argument applies for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies associated to affine Kac–Moody algebra of type $D^{(1)}_{n/2+1}$ with even n, see [19, 29]. Furthermore, by using Theorem 4.4 and the appendix of [29], via τ one can see the relation between the tau function τ_{SSW} and those tau functions defined by Enriquez and Frenkel [7] and by Miramontes [20] for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies.

Remark 4.7 In a recent work [22] (see also [2]), Safronov proposed a geometric definition of tau function for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies. His tau function can be considered, in a sense, as an algebro-geometric version of the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function, which was shown to coincide with the tau function given in (4.15). In the present paper, we derived such an equivalence relation in a more explicit way. We hope that results in this direction would be helpful to understand the Virasoro symmetries for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies [29] from the viewpoint of Kac and Schwarz [18], which we plan to study elsewhere. □

4.3 Tau functions of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies

In the construction of generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies by de Groot, Hollowood and Miramontes [9, 20] (c.f. [8]), the principal Heisenberg subalgebra $\mathcal{H}$ is replaced by the Heisenberg subalgebra $\mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}']}$ corresponding to certain gradation $\mathrm{s}' \in \Gamma$, which is induced by some conjugacy

class of the Weyl group related to the simple Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$ (see [16, 17] for details). Here we only use the form of $\mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}']}$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}']} = \mathbb{C}c \oplus \sum_{j \in E'} \mathbb{C}\Lambda_j,$$

where $\Lambda_j \in \mathfrak{g}_{j\,[\mathrm{s}']}$, and $E' \equiv E'_0 \mod N_{\mathrm{s}'}$ with E'_0 being a collection of l non-negative integers lower than $N_{\mathrm{s}'}$. Similar as before, the elements Λ_j are normalized as

$$[\Lambda_j, \Lambda_k] = j\delta_{j,-k}c \tag{4.37}$$

(here we avoid lengthy notations when E' contains multiple degrees $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_p$ that equal j, in which case $\delta_{j_p,-k_q}$ stands for $\delta_{j,-k}\delta_{p,q}$).

Let $m = \min E'_{>0}$, and let $\Lambda = \Lambda_m \in \mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}']}$ be fixed. We only consider the case that Λ is a semisimple element satisfying (4.8). In this case the generalized hierarchies are called of type I in [9], which contain the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies above as a particular case.

Choose an additional gradation $\mathrm{s} = (s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_l) \preceq \mathrm{s}'$ of $\mathfrak{g}$, namely, $s_i \leq s'_i$ for all i. Introduce an operator

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} + \Lambda + q, \tag{4.38}$$

where q is a smooth function taking value in $\big(\mathfrak{g}_{0\,[\mathrm{s}]} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\leq 0\,[\mathrm{s}']}\big)\big/\,\mathcal{H}_{0\,[\mathrm{s}']}$. Note that the quotient means to modulo variables along trivial or non-independent flows of the hierarchy to be defined (see, for example, Proposition 3.6 in [9]).

With the gradations s^0 and s^1 in Subsection 4.1 replaced by s and s′ respectively, one has an analogy of Proposition 4.1, and hence defines the generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial t_j} = [(e^{\mathrm{ad}_U}\Lambda_j)_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}]}, \mathscr{L}], \quad j \in E'_{>0}, \tag{4.39}$$

up to the gauge actions induced by functions in the nilpotent subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_{0\,[\mathrm{s}]} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}']}$.

To simplify the discussions, let us take $\mathrm{s} = \mathrm{s}'$, hence the hierarchy (4.39) can be recast to a form as (4.14) of a dressing element Θ in the Lie group of $\mathfrak{g}_{<0\,[\mathrm{s}]}$. Accordingly, it applies verbatim the argument in the previous subsection of Baker function and Sato-Segal-Wilson tau function τ_{SSW} for the Grassmannian with two groups like (4.16)–(4.17). Thus we can define τ_{SSW} to be the tau function of the generalized Drinfeld-Sokolov hierarchy corresponding to the Heisenberg subalgebra $\mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}']}$. This definition, due to an analogy of the generalize Sato formula (4.22), can be viewed as a generalization of (4.15) for the original Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies.

Remark 4.8 The system (4.39) with $\mathrm{s} = \mathrm{s}'$ is sometimes called the generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy of modified KdV type, which is related to hierarchies with different s (but the same s′) via Miura-type transformations. □

Example 4.9 Let us take $\mathrm{s} = \mathrm{s}' = \mathrm{s}^0$ being the homogeneous gradation. The homogeneous Heisenberg subalgebra $\mathcal{H}_{[\mathrm{s}^0]}$ contains a basis:

$$\big\{c,\ z^j H_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{jh\,[\mathrm{s}^0]} \mid j \in \mathbb{Z},\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, l\big\}$$

with $h = \sum_{i=0}^{l} k_i$ being the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $E' = l$-ple $h\mathbb{Z}$. Note that the elements $z^j H_i$ may not satisfy the condition (4.37) (linear combinations of them can give the normalized

generators Λ_j in (4.37)). For the homogeneous Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchy, the big cell of the Grassmannian is acted by the following subgroups of $L_{1/2}U_n$:

$$G_- = \left\{ e^X \in L_{1/2}U_n \mid X \in \mathfrak{g}_{j<0\,[\mathrm{s}^0]} \right\}, \tag{4.40}$$

$$G_+^a = \left\{ g(\mathbf{s};z) = \exp\left(\sum_{k\geq 1; 1\leq i\leq l} s_{k,i} z^k H_i \right) \in L_{1/2}U_n \mid s_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \tag{4.41}$$

The Baker function is defined in the same way as before, and the Sato–Segal–Wilson tau function τ_{SSW} is given by the formula (4.22).

From another point of view, since the affine Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ are realized by trace-less matrices and H_α are diagonal, then the corresponding hierarchy can be considered as the AKNS-D hierarchy restricted to affine Kac–Moody algebras, see Section 9.1 in [5] for example (the case of type $A_1^{(1)}$).

Acknowledgments. The author C.-Z. W. thanks Profs. Boris Dubrovin and Youjin Zhang for helpful discussions and constant support.

References

[1] Bertola, M. The dependence on the monodromy data of the isomonodromic tau function. Comm. Math. Phys. 294 (2010), no. 2, 539–579.

[2] Ben-Zvi, D.; Frenkel, E. Spectral curves, opers and integrable systems. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. No. 94 (2001), 87–159.

[3] Böttcher, A; Silberman, B. Introduction to large truncated Toeplitz matrices. Springer–Verlag, 1999.

[4] Cafasso, M. Block Toeplitz determinants, constrained KP and Gelfand-Dickey hierarchies. Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. 11 (2008), no. 1, 11–51.

[5] Dickey, L. A. Soliton equations and Hamiltonian systems. Second edition. Advanced Series in Mathematical Physics, 26. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003.

[6] Drinfeld, V. G.; Sokolov, V. V. Lie algebras and equations of Korteweg-de Vries type. (Russian) Current problems in mathematics, Vol. 24, 81–180, Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform., Moscow, 1984.

[7] Enriquez, B.; Frenkel, E. Equivalence of two approaches to integrable hierarchies of KdV type. Comm. Math. Phys. 185 (1997), 211–230.

[8] Feher, L.; Harnad, J.; Marshall, I. Generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov reductions and KdV type hierarchies. Comm. Math. Phys. 154 (1993), no. 1, 181–214.

[9] de Groot, M. F.; Hollowood, T. J.; Miramontes, J. L. Generalized Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies. Comm. Math. Phys. 145 (1992), no. 1, 57–84.

[10] Hollowood, T. J.; Miramontes, J. L. Tau-functions and generalized integrable hierarchies. Comm. Math. Phys. 157 (1993), no. 1, 99–117.

[11] Its, A. R.; Jin, B. Q.; Korepin, V. E. Entropy of XY Spin Chain and block Toeplitz determinants. In: Binder, I., Kreimer, D. (eds.) Universality and Renormalization. Fields Institute Communications, vol. 50, pp. 151183. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2007).

[12] Jimbo, M.; Miwa, T. Monodromy preserving deformation of linear ordinary differential equations with rational coefficients. II. Phys. D 2 (1981), no. 3, 407–448.

[13] Jimbo, M.; Miwa, T. Monodromy preserving deformation of linear ordinary differential equations with rational coefficients. III. Phys. D 4 (1981/82), no. 1, 26–46.

[14] Jimbo, M.; Miwa, M.; Mori, Y.; Sato, M. Density matrix of an impenetrable Bose gas and the fifth Painlevé transcendent. Phys. D 4 (1980), no.1, 80–158.

[15] Jimbo, M.; Miwa, T.; Ueno, K. Monodromy preserving deformation of linear ordinary differential equations with rational coefficients. I. General theory and τ-function. Phys. D 2 (1981), no. 2, 306–352.

[16] Kac, V. G. Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras. Third edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990, RI, 1989.

[17] Kac, V. G.; Peterson, D. H. 112 constructions of the basic representation of the loop group of E_8. Symposium on anomalies, geometry, topology (Chicago, Ill., 1985), 276–298, World Sci. Publishing, Singapore, 1985.

[18] Kac, V.; Schwarz, A. Geometric interpretation of the partition function of 2D gravity. Phys. Lett. B 257 (1991), no. 3-4, 329–334.

[19] Liu, S.-Q.; Wu, C.-Z.; Zhang, Y. On the Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies of D type. Intern. Math. Res. Notices, 2011, no. 8, 1952–1996.

[20] Miramontes, J. L. Tau-functions generating the conservation laws for generalized integrable hierarchies of KdV and affine Toda type. Nuclear Phys. B 547 (1999), 623–663.

[21] Pressley, A.; Segal, G. Loop groups. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1986.

[22] Safronov, P. Virasoro constraints in Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies. Preprint arXiv: math.AG/1302.3540.

[23] Sattinger, D. H.; Szmigielski, J. S. Factorization and the dressing method for the Gelfand- Dickey hierarchy. Phys. D 64(1993), 1–34.

[24] Segal, G.; Wilson, G. Loop groups and equations of KdV type. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. 61 (1985), 5–65.

[25] Simon, B. Trace ideals and their applications. Second edition. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 120. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. viii+150 pp.

[26] Widom, H. Asymptotic behavior of block Toeplitz matrices and determinants. Advances in Math. 13 (1974), 284–322.

[27] Widom, H. On the limit of block Toeplitz determinants. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 50 (1975), 167–173.

[28] Widom, H. Asymptotic behavior of block Toeplitz matrices and determinants. II. Advances in Math. 21 (1976), no. 1, 1–29.

[29] Wu, C.-Z. Tau functions and Virasoro symmetries for Drinfeld–Sokolov hierarchies. Preprint arXiv: nlin.SI/1203.5750.